

# **FORCE REVIEW BOARD (FRB) TRAINING**

Commander Brian Carney

Bureau of Compliance

# HOUSEKEEPING

- Cell phones away and on vibrate
- If you have to answer a phone call quietly leave the room
- Use the facilities as needed
- Clean up any mess you make
- Sign in sheet

# INTRODUCTION AND FRB TRAINING GOALS

- Overview of the FRB, it's purpose, role and policy
- To gain an understanding of the expectations and outcomes of the FRB
- To be able to review a FRB Use of Force scenario, evaluate the scenario impartially and complete the FRB checklist.
- Every question has merit and may lead to better understanding
- This is not a debate about the policies
- Ask as many questions as necessary to fully understand



# **DOCUMENTS NECESSARY FOR FRB TRAINING**

- FRB GPO
- FRB Checklist
- UOF BlueTeam investigation and related reports
- UOF GPOs if necessary



# OVERALL GOAL

- To have Board members understand the purpose and role of the FRB
- To have Board members feel comfortable with the review of the investigations, identification of relevant issues, and FRB voting process

# LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- Identify the purpose for the Force Review Board
- Understand the role and responsibilities of an FRB member
- To have students understand the FRB checklist and how to apply it

## **PURPOSE OF THE FRB**

- To ensure that the Division's investigations of use of force incidents are thorough, comprehensive and of the highest quality, and that the Division continually analyzes tactics, training, policies, processes, and procedures in order to continually improve, regardless of whether the application of force in any given incident was consistent or inconsistent with policy.



# POLICY

- To serve as a quality control mechanism for UOF investigations, and to appraise UOF incidents from tactics, training, policy, and agency improvement perspectives;
- The will determine if a UOF is thorough and complete;
- There are considerations of de-escalation, supervision, equipment, tactics, training, policy, and best practices; to determine whether the chain of command has appropriately identified and taken actions to correct deficiencies; identify trends or patterns of deficiencies;
- Monitor all aspects of the Division's use of force practices with the goal of continual improvement.

# COMPOSITION OF THE BOARD

- The Chief of Police or his or her designee, who shall serve as Chair of the FRB
- BOC Commander
- IA Superintendent
- A supervisor from the training section
- OPS Administrator;
- A supervisor from each District serving a minimum term of 12 months, when any involved officer(s) are assigned to their District.
- The Data Analysis and Collection Coordinator (DACC). The DACC shall serve as a non-voting advisory member of the FRB.

# **FREQUENCY OF BOARD MEETINGS**

- The FRB shall convene quarterly.
- As necessitated by submitted investigations, the Chair may schedule special meetings more frequently.



# CASES REVIEWED BY THE FRB

- . The DACC shall provide the BOC Commander with a list of investigations, pulled from the use of force tracking software, completed since the prior FRB meeting. The following investigations shall be provided for review by the FRB members two weeks prior to a scheduled FRB meeting:
  - **All FIT investigations**
  - **All Level 2 investigations with a finding of force related misconduct**
  - **A random sample of all Level 2** force in which there was no finding of force-related misconduct. The sample will consist of 10 percent of all such Level 2 investigations or five such Level 2 investigations per meeting, whichever is greater. The DACC will specify the method for selecting a random sample of completed investigations of force incidents and will memorialize that method for the FRB.
- The BOC Commander will provide members a complete copy of investigations to be reviewed during a FRB meeting 2 weeks prior to the meeting.
- The FRB shall conduct comprehensive and reliable reviews of investigations within 90 days of receipt by the FRB. An investigation is considered received by the FRB when that investigation has been forwarded to the BOC Commander.

# **RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FRB MEMBERS**

- Serve a minimum of 12 months
- Notify the BOC Commander if unable to attend
- Complete the initial training
- Receive training annually relevant to their role



# **PROCEDURE FOR REVIEW AND ADJUDICATION OF CASES**

- Chief of Police or designee will chair the FRB
- FRB will vote on all questions and approve or disapprove each section
- The lead FIT investigator will present case for FIT investigations
- A representative from the District where the force occurred for Level 2 UOF



# CONSIDERATIONS FOR EACH REVIEW

- The inactions and inactions of all officers, supervisors, commanders and dispatchers involved in the incident.
- Officer's decision-making at the time the force, including whether the incident raises policy concerns
- Circumstances leading to the UOF
- Tactics
- Information sharing and communication
- Adequacy of supervision

# CONSIDERATIONS FOR EACH REVIEW CONTINUED

- Equipment
- Training
- CDP's medical response if applicable
- Commendable actions
- FRB will review all written reports and recorded evidence
- FRB will assess the the integrity, comprehensiveness, objectivity, thoroughness and timeliness of the UOF investigation



# **FINDINGS NOT SUPPORTED BY THE PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE**

- Order additional investigation to resolve inconsistencies or improve the investigation. Chair will forward investigation back to primary investigator and FRB will review it once returned with corrections.
- Document the reasons for determination that findings are not supported by the preponderance of evidence



# APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL

- Separate findings of administrative approval or disapproval for each member in each incident
- Do not make determinations or recommendations about discipline.
- May recommend non-disciplinary corrective action to improve performance
- Only standing and voting members may vote
- Vote is made by majority (Chair will vote if split)

# REPORTING

- The FRB will use a tracking system to ensure that each of its recommendations have been forwarded to the appropriate Division personnel
- BOC Commander will ensure findings are documented in a report within 15 days to the Chief
- BOC Commander will maintain a record of all recommendations
- BOC Commander shall provide the FRB of a report of the status of FRB recommendations quarterly
- At least annually, the FRB shall examine data related to UOF to detect an patterns, trends and training deficiencies and make recommendations for corrections.



# UOF SCENARIO

- BlueTeam investigation handouts and related reports
- Role play and proceed if we are acting as the FRB to review the incident. We will review the FRB checklist after everyone has reviewed the BlueTeam investigation, reports and viewed the video.



# INCIDENT 2017-239602



# FRB CHECKLIST

- FRB Checklist, BlueTeam investigation, related reports, UOF GPOs if necessary
- The Chair will guide the students through the checklist questions
- Discussion regarding policy and assessing UOF exceptions:
- Age, Gender, Body size, Skill Level, Relative strength, Injury or exhaustion (possible factor why or why not?)
- “What if” scenarios for discussion: Use of deadly force, officer injury, letting the suspect go.

# **FRB CHECKLIST PAGE #1**

- Incident #: 2017-239602
- Date of Incident: 07-26-2017
- Involved Officers: Patrol Officer Kenneth Kirk #572
- Classified Level of Force: Level II
- Investigating Supervisor: Sergeant Andrew Harhay #9136
- Investigating Unit: District 4 Patrol Section
- Date Investigation Complete: 09-05-2017
- Date Follow-Up (if any) Complete: 10-01-2017



# **FRB CHECKLIST PAGE #1 CONT.**

- Date of Board: Today's Date
- Board Chairman: Chief Williams
- Presenter: Commander Carney
- Incident # 2017-239602 (top right corner of every page)
- Questions about the FRB checklist

# FRB CHECKLIST ACCEPTABLE ANSWERS

[INCIDENT #2017-239602]



## CLEVELAND DIVISION OF POLICE FORCE REVIEW BOARD CHECKLIST

INCIDENT INFORMATION	
Incident #:	2017-239602
Date of Incident:	07-26-2017
Involved Officers:	Patrol Officer Kenneth Kirk #572
Classified Level of Force:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level II <input type="checkbox"/> Level III
INVESTIGATION INFORMATION	
Investigating Supervisor:	Sergeant Andrew Harhay #9136
Investigating Unit:	District 4 Patrol Section
Date Investigation Complete:	09-05-2017
Date Follow-up [if any] Complete:	10-01-2017
BOARD INFORMATION	
Date of Board:	Today's Date
Board Chairman:	Chief Williams
PRESENTATION OF INVESTIGATION TO FRB	
Presenter:	Commander Carney

ALL findings by the Board must be supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

A. DECISION MAKING AND TACTICS																							
<p>1. Did the officer(s) decision making and tactics contribute to the need to use force? X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>2. During the whole of the incident, did the officer(s) employ tactics and decision making consistent with:</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">i. Core principles of the Division? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">ii. Training? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p><b>Regardless of whether decision making and tactics are approved or disapproved, summarize follow up action identified:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> None</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chain of command for counseling and entry into tracking software.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation/referral to training section.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Recommendation/referral to policy section</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recommendation of non-disciplinary corrective action (specify):</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">Retraining for UOF reporting and acceptable use of intermediate weapons retraining for P.O.Kirk</p>																						
<p><b>REVIEW OF DECISION MAKING AND TACTICS:</b> List By Each Involved Officer, supervisor, commander, and dispatcher involved the incident, as appropriate.</p> <p><b>Administrative Approval:</b> Based on the documentation provided, the decision-making and tactics employed appear to be consistent with division core principles and training.</p> <p><b>Administrative Disapproval:</b> Based on the documentation provided, the decision-making and tactics employed do not appear to be consistent with division core principles and training.</p>																							
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 70%;">Name and Badge Number</th> <th style="width: 30%;">Approved or Disapproved</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>1.P.O. Kenneth Kirk #572</td><td>Disapproved</td></tr> <tr><td>2.Sgt. Andrew Harhay #9136</td><td>Approved</td></tr> <tr><td>3.Lt. Leonard Poss</td><td>Approved</td></tr> <tr><td>4.Lt. Paul Baeppler</td><td>Approved</td></tr> <tr><td>5.Lt. Timothy Gaertner</td><td>Approved</td></tr> <tr><td>6.Capt. John Sotomayor</td><td>Approved</td></tr> <tr><td>7.Cmdr. Kutz</td><td>Approved</td></tr> <tr><td>8.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>9.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10.</td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Name and Badge Number	Approved or Disapproved	1.P.O. Kenneth Kirk #572	Disapproved	2.Sgt. Andrew Harhay #9136	Approved	3.Lt. Leonard Poss	Approved	4.Lt. Paul Baeppler	Approved	5.Lt. Timothy Gaertner	Approved	6.Capt. John Sotomayor	Approved	7.Cmdr. Kutz	Approved	8.		9.		10.	
Name and Badge Number	Approved or Disapproved																						
1.P.O. Kenneth Kirk #572	Disapproved																						
2.Sgt. Andrew Harhay #9136	Approved																						
3.Lt. Leonard Poss	Approved																						
4.Lt. Paul Baeppler	Approved																						
5.Lt. Timothy Gaertner	Approved																						
6.Capt. John Sotomayor	Approved																						
7.Cmdr. Kutz	Approved																						
8.																							
9.																							
10.																							



**A. DECISION MAKING AND TACTICS COMMENTS:**

P.O. Kirk's actions are not within policy. He depoloyed his Taser at a fleeing suspect and also failed to immediately notify a supervisor. His report was also substandard and exaggerates unnecessarily. Retraining for P.O. Kirk is recommended regarding the proper deployment of the Taser, supervisor notification and report writing.

UOFRB Chair	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Forwarded to Chief's Office By	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Cmdr. Carney		Brian Carney	6127	Bureau of Compliance

[INCIDENT #2017-239602]

<b>B. USE OF FORCE</b>	
The application of the use of force policy does not, and should not, involve inquiries into the involved officer's subjective intent. Instead, the analysis must be conducted from the standpoint of an objectively reasonable officer encountering the same circumstances as the involved officers.	
<b>3. Did the officer(s) involved use <u>de-escalation</u> techniques when safe and feasible to do so under the circumstances?</b>  <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> <b>i. Did the officer(s) involved take reasonable efforts to de-escalate <u>prior to using force</u>?</b>   <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not feasible</div> </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> <b>ii. What de-escalation tactics, or additional de-escalation tactics, might have been used in the circumstances? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> Protective use of distance, cover, concealment, and time (separation, barriers, slowing down incident)  <input type="checkbox"/> Hearing and listening  <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic communication or voice commands to de-escalate the situation  <input type="checkbox"/> Increasing officer presence/calling resources (more personnel, specialized CIT officer, supervisor)  <input type="checkbox"/> Other </div> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> <b>iii. <u>During and/or after using force</u>, did the officer(s) reduce the level of force applied as the nature of the threat diminished?</b>   <div style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not feasible</div> </div>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Force: General, Section V</li> <li>• Use of Force: De-Escalation</li> </ul>
<b>4. Was the officer's use of force <u>necessary</u> to achieve a lawful objective?</b> <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span>  Necessary means "when no reasonable effective alternative to the UOF appears to exist and then only to the degree which is reasonable to effect the intended lawful objective."	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Force: General, Section II</li> </ul>
<b>5. Was the officer's use of force <u>proportional</u> to the level of the subject's resistance?</b> <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span> To be proportional, the level of force applied must reflect the totality of the circumstances known to the officer at the time force was applied. Generally, only the amount of force required to control the subject shall be used by the officer.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Force: General, Section III</li> </ul>
<b>6. Was the officer's use of force <u>objectively reasonable</u>?</b> <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</span>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of Force: General, Section IV</li> </ul>

**8. Did the officer use prohibited force?**X Yes ☐ No• Use of Force: General,  
Section III

<b>1. Use force to subdue a subject(s) who is not suspected of any criminal conduct, other than to protect an officer's or another person's safety?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>2. Use retaliatory force?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>3. Use force against subject(s) who only verbally confront officers and are not involved in criminal conduct?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>4. Use force against subject(s) who are handcuffed or otherwise restrained?</b> If yes, was force nonetheless objectively reasonable and necessary under circumstances to stop an assault, escape, or as necessary to fulfill other law enforcement objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>5. Un-holster and display or unholster and point a firearm?</b> If yes, did the circumstances surrounding the incident create an objectively reasonable belief that the situation may escalate to the point at which deadly force would be authorized?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>6. Use force to overcome passive resistance?</b> If yes, was force necessary, proportional, and objectively reasonable to achieve a legitimate law enforcement objective?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>7. Use force against those who are exercising their First Amendment Rights?</b> If yes, was it necessary and objectively reasonable for the safety of that individual or the public? If yes, was it done with sufficient personnel?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>8. Carry weapons that are not authorized or approved by the Division?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>9. Use a firearm as an impact weapon?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>10. Fire warning shots?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>11. Use deadly force solely to protect property or solely to effectuate an arrest?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>12. Use neck holds?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>13. Discharge a firearm from or at a moving vehicle?</b> If yes, was deadly force justified by something other than the threat of the moving vehicle?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>14. Reach into, or place themselves in the path of a vehicle?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>15. Discharge a firearm at a threat that is not verified and visible?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>16. Use head strikes with hard objects?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

If yes, to any of the questions (numbers 1 through 16) above:

- a. Would a reasonable officer believe that the use of deadly force was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional according to this policy? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- b. (Only if yes to (a)): Did the subject's actions constitute an immediate and grave threat to the officer or others?



c. (Only if yes to (b)): Were there any other force options, techniques, tactics, or choices with the Division's policy available to the officer?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes to (c), the "rare and exceptional circumstances" language in Use of Force: General Section III (B) may apply.

☐ Yes ☐ No

9. Did the officer comply with the Division's policy on providing medical attention following the use of force once the scene is secured?

☒ Yes ☐ No

• Use of Force: General, Section V

**REVIEW OF FORCE APPLIED:** List by Each Involved Officer

**Administrative Approval:** Based on the documentation provided, the force used was objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional; was consistent with the duty to de-escalate; and consistent with all other provisions of the Use of Force Policy.

**Administrative Disapproval:** Based on the documentation provided, the force was not objectively reasonable, necessary, and proportional; was consistent with the duty to de-escalate; and/or was not consistent with all provisions of the Use of Force Policy.

Name and Badge Number	Approved or Disapproved
1. P.O. Kenneth Kirk #572	Disapproved
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

**B. USE OF FORCECOMMENTS:**

P.O. Kirk discharged his Taser at a fleeing suspect who did not pose a threat of physical harm to the officer. It is a violation of GPO 1.1.01. A.

UOFRB Chair	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Forwarded to Chief's Office By	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Cmdr. Carney		Brian Carney	6127	Bureau of Compliance

**C. SUPERVISION**

10. Was there an on-scene supervisor(s)?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, did the on-scene supervisor(s) provide appropriate tactical guidance and support to the field during the incident?

☐ Yes ☐ No

P.O. Kirk failed to request a supervisor respond immediately after the UOF

**REVIEW OF INCIDENT SUPERVISION (For Each On-Scene Supervisor)****Administrative Approval:** The review board finds that the supervision and direction of the incident appears to be consistent with policy and training.**Administrative Disapproval:** The review board finds that the supervision and direction of the incident does not appear to be consistent with policy or training for the following reasons:

Name and Badge	Approved or Disapproved
1. Sgt. Andrew Harhay #9136	Approved
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	



**C. SUPERVISION COMMENTS:**

Sgt. Harhay identified the policy violations involved with the UOF. However, Sgt. Harhay did not timely complete the review and there are no extension requests for the UOF investigation (as required by policy) attached in the BlueTeam investigation. Follow-up recommended to determine if extension requests by Sgt. Harhay exist.”

UOFRB Chair	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Forwarded to Chief's Office By	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Cmdr. Carney		Brian Carney	6127	Bureau of Compliance

D. ANALYSIS OF UNDERLYING INVESTIGATION	
<b>11. Was the investigation conducted and reported to FRB in a timely manner?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No action. Explanation sufficient. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to chain of command for counsel. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Chief's office.
<b>12. Was the investigation objective and complete?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<b>If no, how resolve?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to unit. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Chief's Office.
<b>13. Were the investigation's findings supported by a preponderance of the evidence?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	If no, document reasons for determination, including specific evidence or analysis support Board's conclusions in the comment section, for the Chief of Police.
<b>14. Does there appear to be additional relevant evidence that may assist in resolving inconsistencies or improve the reliability or credibility of the investigation?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<b>If no, how resolve?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to unit. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Chief's office.
<b>15. For Level II investigations, did the Chain of Command properly address and refer the issues identified?</b> • Sergeant <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No • Lieutenant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No • Captain <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Refer back to chain <input type="checkbox"/> Refer to Other _____.

#### REVIEW OF INCIDENT REPORTING AND INVESTIGATION:

**Administrative Approval:** The review board finds that the investigation is thorough and complete. The review board finds that preponderance of the evidence supports the reviewer's determinations.

**Administrative Disapproval:**

- The review board finds that the investigation is not thorough and complete, for the following reasons:
- The review board does not believe that the preponderance of evidence supports the reviewer's determinations for the following reasons:

Name and Badge	Approved or Disapproved
1. Sgt. Andrew Harhay #9136	Disapproved
2. Lt. Leonard Poss	Approved
3. Lt. Paul Baeppler	Approved
4. Lt. Timothy Gaertner	Approved
5. Capt. John Sotomayor	Approved

4. Lt. Timothy Gaertner	Approved
5. Capt. John Sotomayor	Approved
6. Cmdr. Brandon Kutz	Approved
7.	
8.	
9.	
10.	

**D. ANALYSIS OF UNDERLYING INVESTIGATION COMMENTS:**

P.O. Kirk unnecessarily exaggerates his exhaustion stating he “used his last breath to notify radio.” However, his statements that he “has fresh legs” contradicts his reports. He also suggests running the suspect over with his zone car. This comment was made in the presence of a ride along and diminishes the esteem of the Division. The substandard report writing should be addressed with retraining in the Academy. Sgt. Harhay did not timely complete the review and there are no extension requests for the UOF investigation (as required by policy) attached in the BlueTeam investigation. Follow-up recommended to determine if extension requests by Sgt. Harhay exist.

UOFRB Chair	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Forwarded to Chief's Office By	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Cmdr. Brian Carney		Brian Carney	6127	



**E. ADDITIONAL INVOLVED PERSONNEL ISSUES**

16. Were there any issues identified with respect to information sharing or communication? Were all CDP communications protocols followed?

☒ Yes ☐ No

**E. ADDITIONAL INVOLVED PERSONNEL ISSUES COMMENTS:**

UOFRB Chair	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Forwarded to Chief's Office By	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Cmdr. Carney		Brian Carney	6127	Bureau of Compliance

F. BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS		
17. Were there any policy issues raised by this incident? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> None. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer issue to Policy. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer issue to Other
18. Were there any training issues raised by this incident? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> None. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer issue to Training. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer issue to Other
19. Were there any equipment issues raised by this incident? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> None. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer issue to
20. Were there any supervisory issues raised by this incident? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> None. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Refer issue to ___ Cmdr. Kutz _____.
1. Policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
2. Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
3. Supervision	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	
21. Were there any issues raised by this incident related to CPD's medical response? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None. <input type="checkbox"/> Refer issue to
22. Are there any other issues or lessons learned from this incident that should be communicated?  To whom? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None. <input type="checkbox"/> Involved Officers. <input type="checkbox"/> Platoon. <input type="checkbox"/> District. <input type="checkbox"/> Division-Wide. <input type="checkbox"/> Training. <input type="checkbox"/> Policy. <input type="checkbox"/> Public. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____.
23. Were there any actions by involved personnel that warrant commendation? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None. <input type="checkbox"/> Referred for formal commendation.

☐ Referred for informal  
commendation to \_\_\_\_\_.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

Follow up with D4 Cmdr. Kutz to determine if UOF extension requests exist for Sgt. Harhay.

UOFRB Chair	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Forwarded to Chief's Office By	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Cmdr. Brian Carney		Brian Carney	6127	Bureau of Compliance



[INCIDENT #2017-239602]

**FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY**

**Specific Recommendations and Assignments for Follow-Up**

1. **IA/Chain of Command referrals**
  - a. Commander receiving referral: Cmdr. Kutz
  - b. General reason for referral (for each officer above): Follow-up with extension requests of Sgt. Harhay
  - c. BOC to initiate referral via tracking software:
2. **Individual officer training recommendations/Individual referrals**
  - a. Officer being referred for training: P.O. Kirk
  - b. What follow-up is requested: Retraining for P.O. Kirk as it relates to the proper deployment of the Taser and report writing retraining.
  - c. When a response is due: 3-15-20
3. **Department training recommendations**
  - a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
  - b. What follow-up is requested:
  - c. When a response is due:
4. **Policy change or clarification recommendations**
  - a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
  - b. What follow-up is requested:
  - c. When a response is due:
5. **Procedure change or clarification recommendations**
  - a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
  - b. What follow-up is requested:
  - c. When a response is due:
6. **Equipment recommendations**
  - a. To whom it is assigned for follow-up:
  - b. What follow-up is requested:
  - c. When a response is due:

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

UOFRB Chair	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Forwarded to Chief's Office By	Date	Print Name	Badge	Unit #
Cmdr. Carney		Brian Carney	6127	Bureau of Compliance

# REVIEW AND QUESTIONS

- FRB policy questions?
- UOF incident questions?
- FRB checklist questions?